

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

PLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/660,319		09/11/2003	Stephen Baldwin	KCC 4982 (K-C 19,185)	5393	
321	7590	11/22/2006		EXAM	EXAMINER	
SENNIGE				ANDERSON, C	ANDERSON, CATHARINE L	
ONE METROPOLITAN SQUARE 16TH FLOOR			,	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
ST LOUIS,	MO 631	02		3761		
			•	DATE MAILED: 11/22/2006	· 5	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	÷VT .			
	Application No.	Applicant(s) BALDWIN ET AL.		
Advisory Action	10/660,319			
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit		
	C. Lynne Anderson	3761		
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap	pears on the cover sheet wi	th the correspondence ac	Idress	
THE REPLY FILED 25 September 2006 FAILS TO PLACE T	HIS APPLICATION IN COND	ITION FOR ALLOWANCE.		
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or this application, applicant must timely file one of the fol places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in complia- time periods:	llowing replies: (1) an amendn Notice of Appeal (with appeal	nent, affidavit, or other evid fee) in compliance with 37	ence, which CFR 41.31; or (3)	
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the ma	iling date of the final rejection.			
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of thin no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expired.				
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPER		HEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS	FILED WITHIN	
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1 136(a). The da	ate on which the petition under 37	CFR 1 136(a) and the appropri	iate extension fee	

have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed,

2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since

(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for

4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the

7. Tor purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of

8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered

because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and

a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

(a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);

(d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because

9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1). 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. X The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet. 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). 13. Other: \_\_\_\_. TATYANA ZALUKAEVA SUPERVISORY P Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief PTOL-303 (Rev. 08-06)

NOTICE OF APPEAL

appeal; and/or

non-allowable claim(s).

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: \_\_ Claim(s) rejected: \_

**AMENDMENTS** 

may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);

NOTE: . (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The applicant's arguments have been considered but are not persuasive.

In response to the applicant's arugment that Gatto fails to disclose the rheology enhancer as claimed, it is noted that claim 1 discloses as one possible rheology enhancer, di-functional alpha-olefins and styrenes alone. Gatto discloses a rheology enhancer that is incorporated into the lotion formulation as a mixture of various rheology enhancers (column 13, lines 45-47). Gatto further discloses poly-alpha-olefins and styrenes as suitable rheology enhancers (column 15, lines 58-65). Poly-alpha-olefins comprise a plurality of functional groups, and therefore fulfill the limitation of di-functional alpha-olefins. Therefore, the combination of di-functional alpha-olefins and styrenes alone is disclosed by Gatto as a suitable rheology enhancer, and Gatto anticipates the instant claims.